

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 31, 2010. Claims 14, 16 and 17 are pending in the application, with Claim 15 having been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 14, 16 and 17 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Claim 17 has been amended as recommended by the Examiner to recite a computer-readable non-transitory storage medium. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 14 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0086098 (Sesek). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present claims concern an information processing apparatus that caches and manages image data downloaded from a server device for use in processing subsequent print jobs. According to one aspect of the claims, a plurality of image data is designated to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation. The designated image data is then downloaded from the server device, and a cache memory caches the downloaded image data. When a plurality of image data is newly designated, image data which is not successively designated as image data to be printed is deleted from the cache memory, and image data which is successively designated is not deleted from the

cache memory. The newly designated image data is then downloaded to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device. As a result, it is possible to save time and traffic for downloading image data to be printed as well as save the storage area in the cache memory.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 14 is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of communicating with a server device and a printer. The apparatus includes a designation unit configured to designate a plurality of image data to be printed among image data stored in the server device in response to a user operation. The apparatus further includes a downloading unit configured to download the designated image data from the server device, a cache memory configured to cache the downloaded image data, and a print processing unit configured to read the cached image data from the cache memory and execute print processing of the read image data. The apparatus also includes a deletion unit configured to delete from the cache memory the image data which is not successively designated by the designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by the designation unit, when the designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data. The downloading unit downloads the newly designated image data to be printed which is not cached in the cache memory from the server device.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Holmstead and Seseek, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claims 14, 16 and 17. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a deletion unit configured to delete from a cache memory image data which is not

successively designated by a designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by the designation unit, when the designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data.

In contrast to the present claims, Holmstead discloses a system that temporarily stores print job elements in a local memory to be used in future print jobs. Holmstead also discloses the removal of print job elements stored in the local memory after a predetermined period of time has elapsed. In an example described in paragraph [0051] of Holmstead, information stored in directory A can be overwritten (and/or erased) every thirty days, because customer A may print completely different materials every thirty days. As stated by page 3 of the Office Action, in this example of Holmstead, on the thirtieth day, the information that was previously stored in the cache is deleted, and this can take place before the user designates new information to be output. In the present claims, a deletion unit deletes from a cache memory image data which is not successively designated by a designation unit as image data to be printed, and does not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by the designation unit, when the designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data.

In addition, Sesek merely discloses caching of print-ready files of web pages, where an existing print-ready file of a web page is replaced by an updated print-ready file of the same web page whenever that web page has been modified. However, Sesek fails to disclose anything that, when combined with Holmstead, would have resulted in the feature of a deletion unit configured to delete from a cache memory image data which is not successively designated by a designation unit as image data to be printed, and not delete from the cache memory the image data which is successively designated by the

designation unit, when the designation unit newly designates a plurality of image data.

In light of the deficiencies of Holmstead and Seseek as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 14 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended Claims 16 and 17 are directed to a method and a computer-readable non-transitory storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 16 and 17 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Applicant respectfully requests that, once the Examiner is ready to take up action on this Amendment, that Applicant's undersigned attorney be contacted to schedule an interview to discuss the foregoing amendments and remarks in more detail.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher M. Barkley/

Christopher M. Barkley
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 64,329

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200